

## Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		392	
GEF Agency project ID		GLO/91/G33	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Support for Regional Oceans Training Programs	
Country/Countries		Costa Rica (San Jose), Senegal (Dakar), India (Madras), Fiji (Suva)	
Region		CEX (Global)	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		10. International waters: Contaminant-based program	
Executing agencies involved		The International Ocean Institute (IOI) created operating centers in recipient countries to provide training to the public and private sectors. The executing institutions were the following: IOI-San Jose, Costa Rica; IOI-Suva, Fiji; IOI-Dakar, Senegal; and IOI-Madras, India.	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead Executing Agency	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 1, 1991 (Date of project approval, no CEO Endorsement available)	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 1993	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 1995	
Actual date of project completion		First half of 1996	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		2.583	2.583
Co-financing	IA own	2.6	NA
	Government	0.875 (in kind)	NA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		2.583	2.583
Total Co-financing		3.475	NA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.058	NA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		July 15, 1995	
TE submission date		November 28, 1995	
Author of TE		Danny L. Elder	
TER completion date		January 15, 2015	
TER prepared by		Erika Hernandez	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	NA	NA	NA	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	NA	NA	NA	ML
M&E Design	NA	NA	NA	U
M&E Implementation	NA	NA	NA	UA
Quality of Implementation	NA	NA	NA	UA
Quality of Execution	NA	NA	NA	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	NA	NA	NA	MS

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Document (PD), the project has the broad global environmental objective of protection of marine environments in four geographic regions of the world, through promotion of sustainable use of marine resources and their conservation over the long term [PD, p. 1]. As identified in the PD, "intensive ocean use and the resulting pollution threaten marine and planetary environments and contribute to global warming, stratospheric ozone layer depletion and loss of biological diversity. An integrated oceans management strategy for sustainable development - the outcome that this project seeks to achieve - would mitigate this ecological damage" [p. 2, PD].

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project, as stated in the PD, is "to set up an infrastructure for marine affairs" [p. 8, PD]. In the long-term, it seeks to:

- Optimize oceans management to benefit all, especially the developing countries;
- Encourage the productive capacity of the marine environment;
- Enhance the contribution of developing countries to oceans management," [p. 8-9, PD].

At the end of the project, the following four outcomes were expected [p. 3, PD]:

- A self-sustaining institutional infrastructure
- Trained and experienced personnel
- A base of on-site and distance-training methods, techniques, and materials
- Institutional databases.

The PD defines 2 Immediate Objectives and associated Outputs, by which the project will achieve its long-term objectives:

**Immediate Objective 1.** To create an institutional infrastructure for training and research

*Output 1.1* Establish four new self-sustaining operational centers in Colombia, Fiji, India and Senegal;

*Output 1.2* Reinforce links – including distance-learning and library hook-ups – with academic institutions and others in the IOI network associated with marine affairs.

**Immediate Objective 2.** To update and revise the three training programs of the IOI and develop new courses.

*Output 2.1* Revise current courses and develop new ones. Pursue research only when it is policy oriented, relates to marine affairs, and is interdisciplinary and non-proprietary in nature. Each research program will be germane to a particular center.

The project aims to build local capacities in Costa Rica, Senegal, India and Fiji so that they are able to contribute to protection of international waters. It will do so through establishing a self-sustaining institutional infrastructure by creating permanent operational centers capable of providing 1,300 participant weeks of training per year and to coordinate policy research [p. 9, PD].

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

One of the beneficiary countries changed. Instead of establishing an operational center in Cartagena, Colombia, as originally stated in the PD, one was established in San Jose, Costa Rica [p. 6, TE]. The reason for this is not provided in the TE.

#### **4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability**

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>4.1 Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The project is a global project and is relevant to both the GEF and to the regions covered by the project - the Caribbean, the South Atlantic, the South Pacific and the Indian Ocean regions. Its approach is to address issues such as increased world fisheries containing genetically modified marine culture and aquaculture, escalation of petrochemicals and natural gas in the oceans, and increased shipping, causing pollutants. The project seeks to address these issues through support for an integrated oceans management strategy for the sustainable exploitation of resources and development. Specifically, it will reinforce the capacity of four developing countries to manage their ocean resources by means of four operating centers established by the International Ocean Institute (IOI). For the GEF, the project's objectives are consistent with GEF Operational Program 10: *International waters: Contaminant-based program*.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for project effectiveness. This TER rates the project's effectiveness as *moderately satisfactory* as there were moderate shortcomings. Four operational centers were established, training materials were produced, and capacities were developed through training. Shortcomings include: the lack of MoUs with the Governments of Senegal and Costa Rica; IOI-San Jose's underperformance in its training program; failure of the project to establish stronger linkages and coordination with other international programs like UNEP, as called for in the PD; and delayed preparation of course materials by the two most-recently established centers.

Progress towards expected outcomes is detailed further below along project outputs and activities defined in the PD:

*Immediate Objective 1.* To create the institutional infrastructure for the four operational centers (Central America, Pacific, Africa, Asia) including provision for: appointing Directors; providing some administrative support; establishing capabilities for networking electronically (including the International Ocean Institute [IOI] information and knowledge base) and otherwise; the dissemination of information through newsletters and other printed material and reports, and through media-coverage of IOI activities such as *Pacem in Maribus*, and through contacts with the IOI network of alumni."

**Results:**

- Four centers were established in Dakar, Senegal; Suva, Fiji; Madras, India; and in San Jose, Costa Rica instead of Cartagena, Colombia. No information was found in regards to the venue change. The host institutions hold formal agreements with the International Ocean Institute (IOI). The regional outreach of the IOI-San Jose and IOI-Dakar centers is still in a development phase. IOI and Center Directors need to improve their work with their regions so as to improve each regional training program [p. 9, TE].
- The 4 Directors were appointed; Advisory Committees were established but their active role is still being developed [p. 10, TE].
- Capabilities for networking electronically were established through access to coastal ocean management information but "library exchange" has not been achieved [p. 14, TE].
- Dissemination and advertisement of courses has taken place through IOIs network of alumni. TE states that there needs to be more efforts to increase applicants [p. 12, TE]. Newsletters and printed material were channeled through the IOI alumni network.
- Despite the information exchange and support of some IOI activities, that active collaboration and planning is not held regularly [p. 10, TE].

*Immediate Objective 2* is the development of training programs. The project is intended to build on the traditional training programs of IOI (focused on marine technology, management of the EEZ and regional cooperation and development) by preparing new courses focusing on small islands, coastal planning, policy making and convening workshops for decision makers. Other elements foreseen to augment the training

program include: research curriculum and course development, provision of training for those implementing courses and scholarships for participants," [p. 7, TE].

**Results:**

- According to the TE, the number of courses developed exceeded PD targets. However, the targets were not found in the PD. The TE indicates that IOI-Madras is in the process of preparing over 20 course module; IOI-Suva is preparing a coastal economics course and a special course on coralline algae [p. 13, TE].
- Training on new marine technology, the EEZ & regional cooperation offered [p. 10, TE].
- Having provided pedagogical basis for the courses through adopting the TRAIN-X methodology and employing a more integrated approach [p. 9, TE].
- 2 "decision-makers" seminars that contributed to the establishment of a national cabinet-level committee in Fiji; in San Jose it led to an integrated oceans program [p. 9].
- IOI-Suva [see Annex 5, TE]: 5 training courses since 1993 on marine science, management and development of fisheries, coastal zone management, traditional marine tenure, coralline algae and a leadership seminar. Research courses implemented.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
----------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for project efficiency. This TER rates project efficiency as *moderately satisfactory*, based on the evidence presented in the TE narrative. First, the TE states that there were delays in the establishment of IOI-Dakar and IOI-San Jose centers, requiring some components to be restructured and, hence, the completion date was moved from December, 1995 to April, 1997 [p. 6, TE]. Second, the TE indicates that there were some delays related to transfer of funds or equipment purchase due to a lack of capacity on procurement procedures [p. 16-17, TE]. Third, at times, some centers dedicated time to activities, such as the organization of the *Pacim In Maribus (PIM)* meeting by IOI-San Jose, that were outside the project scope and caused delay in the implementation of scheduled project activities. Among all of the centers, establishment of the IOI-San Jose Regional Center was the most challenging. The IOI center for Latin America and the Caribbean was originally intended to be established in Cartagena, Colombia. When this did not happen (for reasons not stated in the TE), San Jose, Costa Rica was chosen impromptu as IOI Regional Center venue. This meant that the Director and the associates had to take some time in getting acquainted with the IOI frame of reference and operating procedures [Annex 3, TE, p. 4].

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: <b>Moderately Likely</b>
--------------------	----------------------------------

The TE did not rate project sustainability. This TER assesses a rating of Moderately Likely for sustainability of project outcomes based on evidence provided in the TE. The 4 IOI Operational Centers were established. These centers are linked to a strong international organization, IOI. There are some concerns regarding the level of work programs that can be sustained post project, and the commitment of partnering and host institutions, but overall, sustainability of project outcomes appears moderately likely.

- Financial Resources (Moderately Likely). The TE identifies two areas of concern going forward: funding to maintain the current level of programming at the centers following cessation of UNDP funding, and funding for the ongoing operations of the 4 established centers. As TE notes, funds for scholarships has been provided by UNDP, but no alternative source of funding has yet been identified. [p. 16, TE]. In addition, thus far, IOI centers have operated through the universities or research institutions in which they were established, who have provided resources such as infrastructure and personnel. However, there is not guarantee that this support will continue post-project. [p. 16, TE]. Two of the IOI centers have obtained external funding from Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, and Japanese sources and one of the IOI centers from its own government. Financial sustainability of IOI would appear to be very strong.
- Sociopolitical Sustainability (Unable to Assess). In general, no sociopolitical indicators were found to determine sustainability. Only for sociopolitical sustainability for IOI Centers was found. But due to the lack of more information, the TER was *unable to assess* this section.
  - *IOI-Dakar*: although an agreement between the IOI and the government has been established, no secure collaborative relationship has been set [Annex 2, TE, p. 3].
  - *IOI-Madras* already has gained recognition by the Government of India and, thus, sends its staff members for professional training there [Annex 4, TE, p. 3].
  - *IOI-Suva*. The Government of FIJI sends its personnel for training at IOI-Suva. Private sector institutions also send their personnel [Annex 5, TE, p. 3]. There is a strong commitment by the government in that the Deputy Permanent Secretary from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is on the Regional Advisory Board [Annex 5, TE, p. 3].
- Institutional Framework and Governance (Moderately Likely). This TE found that in 3 out of the 4 centers there was a strong commitment by their host institutions. However, future commitment from other stakeholders like UNDP has not been identified. All four centers were established. However, progress is required in ensuring the establishment of Advisory councils and expanding collaboration with other organizations.
  - In the case of *IOI-San Jose*, the TE indicates that institutional sustainability will depend on the continued support by the National University of Costa Rica [Annex 3, TE, p. 3].
  - *IOI-Madras*: there is long-term commitment by its host institution, the Indian Institute of Technology (IIT), including in-kind support [Annex 4, TE, p. 3].
  - *IOI-Suva*: has a strong commitment from its host institution [Annex 5, TE, p. 3].
- Environmental Sustainability (Unable to Assess). The TE does not discuss environmental risks to project sustainability.

## 5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The Terminal Evaluation does not report on actual co-financing or the effect of co-financing on project outcomes or sustainability.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project experienced delays. First, there were some delays in the establishment of IOI-Dakar and IOI-San Jose, which caused that some components to be rephrased. Instead of completing the project by December, 1995, its completion date was moved to April, 1997 [p. 6, TE]. Second, the TE indicates that there were some delays related to funds transfer or equipment purchase due to the lack of information of procedures [p. 16-17, TE]. Third, some centers dedicated more time than required to activities that further delayed the implementation of other activities. IOI-San Jose dedicated more time than necessary organizing the *Pacim In Maribus (PIM)* meeting. Among all of the centers, establishing the IOI-San Jose regional Center was challenging. This is because the IOI center for Latin America and the Caribbean was supposed to be inaugurated in Cartagena, Colombia. When this did not happen, San Jose, Costa Rica was then chosen impromptu as IOI Regional Center venue. This meant that the Director and the associates had to take some time in getting acquainted with the IOI frame of reference and operating procedures [Annex 3, TE, p. 4].

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Governments were not directly involved in the execution of the project. Instead, IOI (International Ocean Institute) regional offices were responsible for the executing the project locally. Thus, country ownership was undertaken by the regional offices (IOI-San Jose, IOI-Suva, IOI-Dakar and IOI-Madras). In this project, country ownership affected positively project outcomes and sustainability. On the one hand, country ownership had some negative effects in achieving project outcomes in San Jose. IOI-San Jose affected project implementation in that, as it was established impromptu, it took time to the staff in getting acquainted with the IOI system and its operations. On the other hand, country ownership affected positively project sustainability in Madras. IOI-Madras was solidly established and showed a long-term commitment by its host institution, the Indian Institute of Technology (IIT), including in-kind support [Annex 4, TE, p. 3]. At the center, all of its students of Indian origin receive scholarships. However, foreign students are not funded.

## 6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: <b>Unsatisfactory</b>
------------------------------------	-------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E design. This TER rates M&E design as *unsatisfactory* as there are major shortcomings in M&E Design presented in the PD. PD lacks a logical framework, indicators and targets for all key activities beyond the general descriptions found in the PD on course content and establishment of centers. For example, Activities under Output 1, establishment of centers, includes the activity "Raise finances for the operational centers from sources in the private sector..." but lacks any targets or indicators for assessing progress. Similarly, under Output 2, develop training programs, there is the activity "Devise self-contained and universally applicable training modules for each region," but no targets are indicators are provided to assess progress. The PD does state that the project will be subject to a tripartite review every twelve months by the IOI, the cooperating institution and UNDP. UNDP was in charge of organizing an independent evaluation during the project's second year of operation [p. 13, PD]. In addition, two project activities consist of evaluative elements like testing and evaluating IOI courses continuously (activity 2.1.6) and evaluation of courses and workshops to ensure their flexibility, regional relevance and universal applicability [p. 9-11, PE]. No detailed implementation schedule for M&E is provided beyond the call for annual reviews. No general M&E budget is presented, although a budget allotment is given for the course evaluation activity [p. 15, PD] and GEF Project reviews [PD, p. 12].

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Unable to Assess</b>
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E Implementation. This TER was unable to assess M&E Implementation because the project did not present enough information on monitoring. It did present basic monitoring in the form of an external mid-term evaluation and a terminal evaluation. No Project Implementation Reviews (PIRs) were found at the PMIS system but they might not have been uploaded. This mid-term evaluation was carried out during May-June 1995. The evaluation found out that the project's activities of IOI were an intimate component of the project, making it difficult for the evaluation to assess project outcomes since many of IOI's programs were not clearly distinguished from those specifically supported by the project [p. 10, TE]. Although some evaluation of courses is expected to be carried out, the TE recommends initiating the evaluation for those courses already taking place [p. 18, TE]. M&E training of parties is not identified in the Terminal Evaluation.



## 7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Unable to Assess</b>
--	---------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for the quality of project implementation. This TER rates this section as *Unable to Assess* because, aside from project funding, it is not possible to know whether UNDP participated in other project activities as there is no information on this provided in the TE. UNDP's role took place in allocating funds, which were often used as fellowships for course participants, networking and consultative meetings of the IOI Board, regional Directors and the Course Development Committee [p. 9, TE]. However, training by UNDP or other forms of collaboration are not addressed. Project design by UNDP had major shortcomings as it lacks a logical framework, indicators and targets for all key activities beyond the general descriptions found in the PD on course content and establishment of centers. Moreover, the TE indicates that the "UNDP should use its good offices to assist in" regional outreach where appropriate. It suggests providing assistance through other UNDP projects on biodiversity, international waters, and coastal zone managements where linkages with regional seas conventions are present [p. 18, TE]. For IOI-Suva, the evaluation team discusses with the UNDP Assistant Resident Representative about the need of getting support from UNDP to establish collaborate linkages with the South Pacific Regional Environment Program (SPREP) [p. 2, Annex 5, TE].

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
---	--

The TE does not provide a rating for the quality of project execution. This TER noted that quality of Project Execution varied in the individual regional centers. Overall, this TER rates the quality as *moderately satisfactory* given the extent of progress made in establishing the 4 centers and developing course offerings, and the shortcomings regarding the creation of collaborative networks. The number of courses prepare by the centers exceeds the expected number, as per the TE [p. 13]. On the one hand, regional outreach by IOI-San Jose and IOI-Dakar is still in a development phase. IOI-Dakar appears to have formed a Steering Committee to adapt materials; has assigned 2 persons to work on the Train-Sea-Coast and IOI courses; as well as has managed to have an attendance of 300 African participants for its 1990-1993 workshops [Annex 2, TE]. However, it has not established collaborative contacts with the Regional Seas program [Annex 2, TE]. On the other hand, IOI-Suva and IOI-Madras appear to be doing a good job in ensuring that the project reaches its goals or in ensuring its financial sustainability. For instance,

IOI-Suva has secured US \$10 million from Japanese sources. Moreover, it has been the Center which has produced the “most extensive training materials.” Between 1992 to mid-1995, 11 courses were conducted with 360 participants [Annex 4, TE].

## 8. Assessment of Project Impacts

***Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.***

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

No changes in environmental stress or status are noted in the TE to have occurred by the end of the project. The Terminal Evaluation points out that, through increased knowledge about environmental management, the new classes will have an impact on marine and coastal resources management but such impact was not assessed.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

No socioeconomic changes are noted in the TE to have occurred by the end of the project. However, a better management of the exclusive economic zones is expected.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

Knowledge skills have been developed and their target on the number of courses has exceeded, as per the TE, but an impact assessment has not been conducted up until the time the TE was submitted. The TE mentions that there was one new course each on coastal zone management and on islands, and four sensitizing seminars, additional to course specifications. During this external evaluation, course evaluations have not been developed but are to be developed in the long-run. Environmental monitoring systems had not established at the moment of the TE's writing.

#### b) Governance

Although no laws or regulations as product of this project's activities have been adopted, Memoranda of Understanding (MoU) and Memoranda of Agreements have been adopted with the Governments Fiji. Although TE's Annex 4 for IOI-Madras does not mention whether there is a signed MoU with the Government of India, it seems that this understanding is taking place given that the government has been sending several government officials for training at that center. MoU with the government of Costa Rica is still under review. As for IOI-Dakar, no MoU seems to exist; however, since it is hosted within a public institution, the Centre de *Recherche Oceanographique-Dakar* from the *Institute Senegalaise de Recherches Agricole* (ISRA), an indirect agreement seems to be in place [Annex 2, TE].

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts are noted in the TE to have occurred by the end of the project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

No other similar initiatives were identified.

## 9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE did not identify key lessons or good practices. However, one approach that the TE considered successful was the gradual adoption of TRAIN-X methodology and employing a more integrated and consolidated approach to the traditional IOI courses [p. 9, TE].

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following are the recommendations provided by the TE:

### Development Objective, Immediate Objectives, Outputs and Activities

- 1) The next Director and Board Meeting should consider the recommendations made in this evaluation and the objectives and activities to be carried out (...); on the basis of this review, IOI in collaboration with UNDP should revise, where necessary the work plan and time-table of the project;

### Project Impact on the Effectiveness of IOI Training Activities

- 2) A "needs analysis of IOI courses globally and on a region by region basis should be carried out (...); it should include an analysis of the comparative advantages IOI possesses (...);
- 3) The "needs analysis" (...) should be augmented with more frequent "hands-on" assistance from IOI Headquarters in formulating approaches to be taken for training and awareness exercises (...);
- 4) Follow-up on the determination of a need for, and development of credit courses (...), with a view to developing a masters-level degree course;
- 5) For IOI globally and for each Regional Center, formulate a plan for outreach and dissemination of information, including provision for linkages with other international and regional programs;

### Training materials

- 6) The CU Unit of the Train-Sea-Coast network and other trained in course development should participate regularly in the course preparation efforts of the centers so that the overall approach of IOI in preparing course materials at the global and regional level is rationalized;
- 7) In consultation with the Directors of the Regional Centers, reassess the need for a "library exchange" capability and take appropriate steps to follow up on the findings;

### Institutional Structure

- 8) (...) disseminate a summary of the UNDP project including its context, aims and intended outputs;

- 9) Prepare a "corporate" strategy for IOI based on the vision statement and formulate a work plan and timetable for activities to be carried out by specific Board Members;
- 10) Prepare a "guide" on IOI's strategy and goals and an "operational manual" for use by new IOI centers in establishing themselves;
- 11) Formulate a work plan and timetable for more frequent missions to IOI Regional Centers by the Executive Director, Founder and selected Board members;
- 12) Develop a plan for "regionalizing" the membership of the IOI Board, in particular taking into account the geographic distribution of IOI Centers;
- 13) Take action to ensure that each center establishes a formal Advisory Committee which includes individuals that can actively assist the Directors in formulation and implementation of IOI regional activities;
- 14) Formulate a work plan and timetable activities to be pursued by each Regional Advisory Committee including the development of regional strategies, outreach activities and fund-raising efforts;

#### Host Institution / IOI Agreements

- 15) For each IOI regional center determine the optimum legal status that will ensure their long-term existence and take steps for obtaining such status for each center;

#### Sustainability

- 16) A financial plan for ensuring continuity of the work of each of the centers after the termination of the project should be formulated and implemented as soon as possible;

#### Inputs from Project Partners; and Project Execution Arrangements

- 17) Prepare a brief note describing operational procedures to be followed for the administration and implementation of the GEF project and for others where appropriate;
- 18) The TRAIN-SEA-COAST Coordination Unit should become more actively involved in development of training materials on a region-by-region basis by participating in the implementation of the "needs" analysis recommended above;
- 19) Take steps to improve the routine communications linkages between the centers and IOI Headquarters, in particular by establishment of e-mail linkages where appropriate (especially Malta), and more frequent use of conference calls involving the regional centers;

#### Other Issues

- 20) IOI Headquarters and IOI regional Directors should establish contact with UNEPIOCA-PAC (...) for specific regional seas (especially for SPREP, West Africa, the wider Caribbean, Indian Ocean and Asia) and agree on a mechanism, activities and steps for ensuring future collaboration;
- 21) In cooperation with UNDP carry out an analysis of UNDP activities and projects that are potentially related to IOI activities and determine how collaborative linkages between these and IOI might be forged;
- 22) The original aims for the research component under the project needs to be reassessed and a framework, and work plan for research efforts should be formulated;
- 23) Formulate and implement a program of evaluating the long-term effect of courses including their contribution to achieving the development objective of the project.

## 10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	<i>Assessment of relevant outcome and impacts is provided but in a different format than that presented in the PD that is difficult to follow. However, an examination per component was made.</i>	<b>MS</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	<i>The report is internally consistent. No ratings are provided by the TE, as they were not a requirement of the GEF at the time. Report is convincing overall.</i>	<b>MS</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	<i>The TE does a good job in assessing financial and institutional sustainability and in providing alternatives in case of financial need. However, it does not provide information on other key risks to sustainability, including socioeconomic and governance.</i>	<b>MS</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	<i>The project does not have a section for lessons learned but does offer recommendations. Overall, more evidence should have been provided to support recommendations.</i>	<b>MS</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	<i>The report does not include actual project costs and co-financing.</i>	<b>HU</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	<i>TE does not discuss project M&amp;E design or implementation other than in passing.</i>	<b>U</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

Overall TE rating:  $(0.3 * (4+4)) + (0.1 * (4+4+1+2)) = 2.4 + 1.1 = 3.5 = \text{MS}$

## 11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

*1996 PIR; TE and PD.*